

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-15 and 57-77 were and remain pending for examination. All other claims, which were previously withdrawn, have been canceled herein. Claims 7, 11, 15, 57, and 61 have been amended herein. No additional fee is due at this time. The Examiner has requested the cancellation of the withdrawn claims, and Applicant has herein canceled these claims.

The Examiner has rejected all remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the phrase "standard meaning" as used in the independent claims is not defined in the claims. To make these concepts perfectly clear in the claims, Applicant has replaced this language in the independent claims with the recitation "status information of the premises wherein the status information cannot be represented by a single physical input." This recitation is discussed in Applicant's specification, for example, in paragraph [0030]. This recitation is incorporated in all dependent claims through dependency from the base claims. Applicant submits that all claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of all claims in view of Dolin under either 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner continues to cite portions of Dolin in which actions are taken based on individual sensor readings, such as the reading of a temperature sensor, in his rejection under Section 102. The Examiner's reasoning is flawed for at least two reasons. Firstly, the status of a temperature sensor can be (and is, in Dolin) represented by a single physical input, and thus the idea of reading and evaluating the status of a temperature sensor is exactly the opposite of, and teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention, which handles status information that cannot be represented by a single physical input, as discussed above.

Secondly, MPEP § 2131 provides that for a claim to be anticipated, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the . . . claim," and that, "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim . . ." Applicant's independent claims all carefully recite that a *plurality* of data entries related to the premises producing a *plurality* of Boolean results, which are then combined. Thus, multiple premises conditions can be aliased into one virtual input for convenient addressing and control. These recitations follow the structure of the example that is laid out in Fig. 6 and described in the accompanying discussion in the specification. This arrangement as claimed is not shown or discussed anywhere in Dolin.

The Examiner can not meet the burden imposed on him by MPEP § 2131 and the case law cited therewith by pointing to individual expressions and lines of code in the reference and simply stating they are "Boolean" or show a "logical relationship." Applicant respectfully again submits that independent claims 7, 11, 15, 57, and 61, as well as the dependent claims, which incorporate the same recitations through dependency, are patentably distinguishable from Dolin.


While Applicant believes dependent claims 69, 71, 73, 75, and 77, which were separately rejected under Section 103, are patentable over Dolin for at least the same reasons discussed above; Applicant provides the following additional reason why these claims are not obvious over Dolin. These claims all recite the specification of a unit number and an input number. The Examiner seems to analogize this designation in the office action to Dolin's table numbers and sensor numbers. However, a unit number as described and defined in Applicant's specification identifies a hardware platform, for example, an I/O unit. See paragraphs [0032]-[0042]. A term in Applicant's claims cannot mean whatever the Examiner wants it to mean, the term must mean what it is defined to mean in Applicant's specification. Dolin does not disclose or suggest a protocol for identifying inputs in a distributed system using a unit number *and* an input number as claimed by Applicant. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 7, 11, 15, 57, and 61 are patentable over Dolin for at least this additional reason.

The Examiner has failed to show that every element of any claim is present in the art cited. Applicant believes he has responded to all of the concerns raised by the Examiner. Reconsideration of this application as amended is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter D. Hallenbeck

Date: 6 Dec 2006

By:


Steven B. Phillips
Registration No. 37,911
Attorney for Applicant
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199